

Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization of symmetric Chern-Simons theory

Won Tae Kim^{a*}, Chang-Yeong Lee^{b†}, and Dong Won Lee^{c‡}

^a *Department of Physics and Basic Science Research Institute,
Sogang University, C.P.O. Box 1142, Seoul 100-611, Korea*

^b *Department of Physics, Sejong University, Seoul 143-747, Korea*

^c *Department of Physics, Kon-kuk University, Seoul 143-701, Korea*

Abstract

We study the manifestly covariant three-dimensional symmetric Chern-Simons action in terms of the Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization method. We find that the Lorentz covariant gauge fixed version of this action is reduced to the usual Chern-Simons type action after a proper field redefinition. Furthermore, the renormalizability of the symmetric Chern-Simons theory turns out to be the same as that of the original Chern-Simons theory.

*electronic address: wtkim@ccs.sogang.ac.kr

†electronic address: leecy@kunjja.sejong.ac.kr

‡electronic address: dwlee@kkucc.konkuk.ac.kr

Chern-Simons(CS) theory [1] has been studied in various arena. The key structure which gives interesting phenomena is due to the unusual commutator between the gauge fields, which is essentially arisen from the Dirac method for the quantization of second class constraint system [2]. On the other hand, the second class constraint system can be in principle converted into the first class constraint system by use of the Batalin-Fradkin-Tyutin(BFT) method [3] in the Hamiltonian formalism. The resulting first class constraint system is invariant with respect to the local symmetry implemented by the first class constraints. A few years ago, the second class constraint of the CS theory coupled to some complex fields was converted into first class one in the BFT Hamiltonian method [4], and subsequently straight forward non-Abelian extension was performed [5]. However, the Wess-Zumino like action to convert the second class system into first class one in the Lagrangian formulation depends on the content of matter couplings, and general covariance is unfortunately lost.

Recently, the manifestly covariant symmetric CS action has been obtained [6]. The newly obtained one has only first class constraints unlike the usual one which has both first class constraints and second class constraints. The symmetric CS theory can be obtained by simply substituting the original gauge field in the CS action with the infinite sum of newly introduced auxiliary vector fields [6]. Note that at first sight, the appearance of the resulting symmetric CS action seems to be the same form as the original CS action, however, it is nonlocal in that the infinite series of auxiliary fields are involved in the symmetric action. Of course, in the unitary gauge, the original local CS action is reproduced.

On the other hand, the Abelian CS theory coupled to the complex matter fields was reconsidered in [6] as a physical application, which is essentially first class constraint system. By analyzing this model without any gauge fixing condition, one can naturally obtain gauge-independent anyon operators which are also free from path-ordering problems between field operators. Therefore, in the symmetric formulation, the construction of anyon operator is simply realized in the gauge-independent way without any ordering problems.

In this paper, we study the symmetric CS action which has full symmetries by use of the Batalin-Vilkovisky(BV) [7] quantization method, and show the equivalence between the

symmetric CS action and the original CS action. We find that the gauge fixed version of this action turns out to be the same as the usual Chern-Simons type after a proper field redefinition. Furthermore, the renormalizability program turns out to be the same as that of the original Chern-Simons theory.

We now first recapitulate the gauge structure of the non-Abelian CS theory. The CS action with fully first class constraints is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{SCS}} = & \kappa \int d^3x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \text{tr} \left[(A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}) \partial_\nu (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)}) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{2}{3} i (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}) (A_\nu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\nu^{(n)}) (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the diagonal metric $g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+, -, -)$ and $\epsilon^{012} = +1$. The Lie algebra-valued gauge field is defined by $A_\mu = A_\mu^a T^a$ satisfying $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$ and $\text{tr}(T^a T^b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ab}$ where T^a is a Hermitian generator. A_μ is an original gauge field and $B_\mu^{(n)}$ are auxiliary vector fields introduced to make the second class constraints into the first class constraints [6]. The Lagrangian is invariant under the following gauge transformations up to a total divergence,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_\mu &= D_\mu \epsilon^{(0)} + \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}, \epsilon^{(0)} \right] + \epsilon_\mu^{(1)}, \\ \delta B_\mu^{(n)} &= -\epsilon_\mu^{(n)} + \epsilon_\mu^{(n+1)} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon^{(0)}$ and $\epsilon^{(n)}$ are independent parameters of the local symmetries and $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + [A_\mu, \]$. Considering the commutator of two gauge transformations of the above type (2), we see that

$$[\delta_1, \delta_2] A_\mu^a = D_\mu (f_{bc}^a \epsilon_1^{(0)b} \epsilon_2^{(0)c}) + f_{bc}^a B_\mu^{(n)b} f_{de}^c \epsilon_1^{(0)d} \epsilon_2^{(0)e}, \quad (3)$$

$$[\delta_1, \delta_2] B_\mu^{(n)a} = 0, \quad (4)$$

and thus $\epsilon_{12}^{(0)a} = f_{bc}^a \epsilon_1^{(0)b} \epsilon_2^{(0)c}$. These relations tell us that only the gauge parameter $\epsilon^{(0)}$ has the original group structure, and the symmetry algebra is closed and irreducible.

To quantize the symmetric CS action (1), we impose the restriction to the space of all histories in order to get the constrained surface Σ . In the BV formalism [7], an antifield Φ^* for each field Φ is introduced to implement this procedure. In our case, Φ includes the

gauge fields A_μ^a , $B_\mu^{(n)a}$ as well as the ghost fields C^a and $C_a^{(n)}$ which are corresponding to the gauge parameters $\epsilon_a^{(0)}$ and $\epsilon_a^{(n)}$, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^A &= (A_\mu^a, B_\mu^{(n)a}, C^a, C_\mu^{(n)a}), \\ \Phi_A^* &= (A_{\mu a}^*, B_{\mu a}^{(n)*}, C_a^*, C_{\mu a}^{(n)*}).\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

The ghost number and statistics of Φ_A^* are assigned as

$$\begin{aligned}gh[\Phi_A^*] &= -gh[\Phi^A] - 1, \\ \epsilon(\Phi_A^*) &= \epsilon(\Phi^A) + 1 \pmod{2},\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

such that the statistics of Φ_A^* is opposite to that of Φ^A . Then the anti-bracket is defined by

$$(X, Y) \equiv \frac{\partial_r X}{\partial \Phi^A} \frac{\partial_l Y}{\partial \Phi_A^*} - \frac{\partial_r X}{\partial \Phi_A^*} \frac{\partial_l Y}{\partial \Phi^A}.\tag{7}$$

In the BV formalism, the action $S[\Phi, \Phi^*]$ should be a functional of fields and antifields satisfying the master equation,

$$(S, S) = 2 \frac{\partial_r S}{\partial \Phi^A} \frac{\partial_l S}{\partial \Phi_A^*} = 0.\tag{8}$$

The solution S of the master equation can be expanded in a power series in antifields. In our case, it has non-vanishing structure constants only up to the first order, and the minimal solution for the master equation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{Min}} &= \int d^3x \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \left[(A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a \partial_\nu (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)})^a \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{3} f_{bc}^a (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a (A_\nu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\nu^{(n)})^b (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)})^c \right] \\ &\quad + \int d^3x \left[A_{\mu a}^* (D^\mu C^a + f_{bc}^a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)b} C^c + C_a^{(1)\mu}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_{\mu a}^{(n)*} (-C_a^{(n)\mu} + C_a^{(n+1)\mu}) + \frac{1}{2} f_{bc}^a C_a^* C^b C^c \right].\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

At this stage, the BRST variation of a functional X is given by the anti-bracket with the minimal action

$$\delta_B X \equiv (X, S_{\text{Min}}), \quad (10)$$

and thus we obtain the BRST transformations for fields and antifields as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_B A_a^\mu &= D^\mu C^a + f_{bc}^a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)b} C^c + C_a^{(1)\mu}, \\ \delta_B A_\mu^{*a} &= -\frac{\partial_l S_0}{\partial A_a^\mu} - f_{bc}^a A_\mu^{*c} C^b, \\ \delta_B B_a^{(n)\mu} &= -C_\mu^{(n)a} + C_\mu^{(n+1)a}, \\ \delta_B B_\mu^{(n)*a} &= -\frac{\partial_l S_0}{\partial B_a^{(n)\mu}} - f_{bc}^a A_\mu^{*c} C^b, \\ \delta_B C^a &= \frac{1}{2} f_{bc}^a C^b C^c, \\ \delta_B C_a^* &= -D^\mu A_\mu^{*a} + f_{bc}^a B^{(n)\mu b} A_\mu^{*c} - f_{bc}^a C_b^* C_c, \\ \delta_B C_a^{(n)\mu} &= 0, \\ \delta_B C_{\mu a}^{(n)*} &= B_{\mu a}^{(n-1)*} - B_{\mu a}^{(n)*}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $B_{\mu a}^{(0)*} = A_{\mu a}^*$. One can check that with the above transformation (11) the minimal action satisfies the master equation:

$$(S_{\text{Min}}, S_{\text{Min}}) = 0. \quad (12)$$

We are now in a position to fix a gauge, and to do that we add an auxiliary action which is a trivial-pair type solution of the master equation,

$$S_{\text{Aux}} = \int d^3x (\bar{\pi}_a \bar{C}_a^{*} + \bar{\pi}_a^{(1)\mu} \bar{C}_{a\mu}^{(1)*} + \dots + \bar{\pi}_a^{(n)\mu} \bar{C}_{a\mu}^{(n)*} + \dots). \quad (13)$$

Obviously, the combined action, which we will call non-minimal,

$$S_{\text{NM}} = S_{\text{Min}} + S_{\text{Aux}}, \quad (14)$$

satisfies the master equation (8), and contains the non-minimal set of fields $(\bar{\pi}, \bar{\pi}^{(n)}, \bar{C}, \bar{C}^{(n)})$.

For the elimination of antifields, we choose the so-called gauge-fixing fermion Ψ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= \int d^3x \left[\bar{C}_a \partial^\mu (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{C}_{\mu a}^{(n)} B^{(n)\mu a} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left[\frac{\bar{C}_a \bar{\pi}_a}{\xi_0} + \frac{\bar{C}_{\mu a}^{(1)} \bar{\pi}_a^{(1)\mu}}{\xi_1} + \dots + \frac{\bar{C}_{\mu a}^{(n)} \bar{\pi}_a^{(n)\mu}}{\xi_n} + \dots \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

which is *admissible* [8], so that the theory becomes non-degenerate. Note that the above choice of the gauge fixing fermion Ψ corresponds to two types of gauge fixing conditions for the fields A_μ and $B_\mu^{(n)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(0)} &= \partial^\mu (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}), \\ U^{(n)} &= B_\mu^{(n)}, \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The antifields Φ^* are eliminated by the relation $\Phi^* = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \Phi}$, and our choice of Ψ yields the following relations.

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^{*a} &= -\partial_\mu \bar{C}^a, \\ B_\mu^{(1)*a} &= -\partial_\mu \bar{C}^a + \bar{C}_\mu^{(1)a}, \\ B_\mu^{(n)*a} &= -\partial_\mu \bar{C}^a + \bar{C}_\mu^{(n)a}, \\ \bar{C}_a^* &= \partial^\mu (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\pi}}{\xi_0}, \\ \bar{C}_\mu^{(n)*a} &= B_\mu^{(n)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\pi}_\mu^{(n)}}{\xi_n}, \\ C^* &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Plugging these into the non-minimal action S_{NM} and after performing Gaussian integrations over the field $\bar{\pi}$ and $\bar{\pi}^{(n)}$, we obtain the following gauge-fixed action,

$$\begin{aligned} S_\Psi &= \int d^3x \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \left[(A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a \partial_\nu (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)})^a \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{3} f_{bc}^a (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a (A_\nu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\nu^{(n)})^b (A_\rho + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\rho^{(n)})^c \right] \\ &\quad + \int d^3x \left[\bar{C}_a \partial_\mu (D^\mu C^a + f_{bc}^a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)b} C^c) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{C}_{\mu a}^{(n)} (-C^{(n)\mu} + C^{(n+1)\mu})_a + \frac{\xi_0}{2} (\partial^\mu (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}))^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_n}{2} (B_\mu^{(n)})^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

One thing we have to note is that the (anti)ghost fields $\bar{C}_\mu^{(n)}$ and $C_\mu^{(n)}$ do not have kinetic terms and these fields simply provide delta function relations among $C_\mu^{(n)}$'s, $\delta(C_\mu^{(n)} - C_\mu^{(n+1)})$, if we integrate over $\bar{C}_\mu^{(n)}$.

Now, the BRST transformation of a functional X after gauge fixing is given by the anti-bracket with the non-minimal action S_{NM} restricted on Σ_Ψ

$$\delta_{B_\Psi} X \equiv (X, S_{NM})|_{\Sigma_\Psi}, \quad (19)$$

where Σ_Ψ denotes the constraint surface determined by the condition

$$Y(\Phi, \Phi^*)|_{\Sigma_\Psi} \equiv Y(\Phi, \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \Phi}). \quad (20)$$

Thus, the final BRST transformation after gauge fixing is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{B_\Psi} A_a^\mu &= D^\mu C^a + f_{bc}^a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)b} C^c + C_a^{(1)\mu}, \\ \delta_{B_\Psi} B_a^{(n)\mu} &= -C_\mu^{(n)a} + C_\mu^{(n+1)a}, \\ \delta_{B_\Psi} C^a &= \frac{1}{2} f_{bc}^a C^b C^c, \\ \delta_{B_\Psi} C_a^{(n)\mu} &= 0, \\ \delta_{B_\Psi} \bar{C}^a &= \xi_0 \partial^\mu (A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)})^a, \\ \delta_{B_\Psi} \bar{C}_\mu^{(n)a} &= \xi_{(n)} B_\mu^{(n)a}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

One can again check that the gauge fixed action S_Ψ is invariant under the above BRST transformation (21).

We now turn to the renormalizability of the theory. To find the propagators, we first express the quadratic part of the gauged fixed action (18) for the fields $A_\mu, B_\mu^{(n)}$,

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} A_\rho & B_\rho^{(1)} & B_\rho^{(2)} & B_\rho^{(3)} & \dots & \\ A_\mu & C & C & C & C & \dots \\ B_\mu^{(1)} & C & C + D_1 & C & C & \dots \\ B_\mu^{(2)} & C & C & C + D_2 & C & \dots \\ B_\mu^{(3)} & C & C & C & C + D_3 & \dots \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \quad (22)$$

where $C = \kappa \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} P_\nu - \xi_0 P^\mu P^\rho$, $D_n = -\xi_n g^{\mu\rho}$. After diagonalization, this can be written as

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
\bar{A}_\rho & B_\rho^{(1)} & B_\rho^{(2)} & B_\rho^{(3)} & \dots & \\
\bar{A}_\mu & C & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\
B_\mu^{(1)} & 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\
B_\mu^{(2)} & 0 & 0 & D_2 & 0 & \dots \\
B_\mu^{(3)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & D_3 & \dots \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot
\end{array} \tag{23}$$

where $\bar{A}_\mu$ is defined as

$$\bar{A}_\mu \equiv A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}. \tag{24}$$

If we set the dimensionless parameter $\kappa = 1$, then we obtain the following propagator for the field $\bar{A}_\mu$.

$$\Delta_{\mu\nu}^{ab} = \frac{1}{p^2} \left[\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} p^\rho - \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{\xi_0 p^2} \right] \delta^{ab}. \tag{25}$$

For the ghost field C^a , the propagator is given by

$$\Lambda_{ab} = \frac{1}{p^2} \delta_{ab}. \tag{26}$$

The propagators for $B_\mu^{(n)}$ are trivial and decouples from the theory. Remember that integrating out $\bar{C}_\mu^{(n)}$ in the gauge fixed action (18) gives the delta function relations among $C_\mu^{(n)}$'s. Thus after the field redefinition these relations tell us that the BRST variations of $B_\mu^{(n)}$ are vanishing. Also, the BRST variation of $\bar{A}_\mu$ becomes the usual one,

$$\delta \bar{A}_\mu^a = \partial_\mu C^a + f_{bc}^a \bar{A}_\mu^b C^c,$$

whereas the original variation of A_μ (21) before the field redefinition contains an extra ghost field $C_\mu^{(1)}$. Thus the propagating fields are only $\bar{A}_\mu$, C^a , and $\bar{C}^a$, just like the original CS theory. Furthermore, the contributing propagators are the same as in the usual CS theory which had been investigated and shown to be one-loop renormalizable [9,10]. Therefore, we can conclude that our generalized first-class action has the same renormalizability property as the usual CS action and hence one-loop renormalizable.

This result is somewhat expected, because our starting symmetric CS action (1) is designed to maintain the local physical properties in the enlarged configuration space. After all, it should be possible that the enlarged first class system be gauged away by a certain gauge condition, and our gauge condition (16) leads to the same physics as that of the usual CS theory.

As a comment, one might wonder why the form of the symmetric action (1) which is fully first class constraint system is the same as that of the original CS action when one defines $\bar{A}_\mu = A_\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_\mu^{(n)}$. That is, the second class constraint algebra seems to appear again in the symmetric action case, if one regards $\bar{A}_\mu$ as a fundamental field. However, this is not the case since $\bar{A}_\mu$ is not a fundamental local field but composed of infinite number of vector fields. Therefore, we should note that the starting action (1) is in some sense a nonlocal action. Unfortunately, we do not know at this stage how to convert the second class constraint system of CS action into the first class constraint system by introducing only finite number of auxiliary fields.

In summary, we quantized the symmetric CS action in the BV formalism. In the symmetric CS theory, the auxiliary vector fields $B_\mu^{(n)}$ can be naturally eliminated after diagonalizing the quadratic part of the action. The propagator of the nonlocal vector field $\bar{A}_\mu$ which involves the infinite number of auxiliary vector fields is remarkably written as the same form as that of the pure CS theory. As a result, it is equivalent to the original CS theory under the proper gauge condition, and renormalizable similarly to the original CS action.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

W.T.K. was supported in part by the Basic Science Research Institute Program, the Ministry of Education, Project No. BSRI-98-2414, and C.Y.L. and D.W.L. were supported in part by the Ministry of Education, BSRI-98-2442, and KOSEF Grant 971-0201-007-2.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Ann. of Phys. **140** (1982) 372; R. Jackiw, *Topological Investigations of Quantized Gauge Theories* (World Scientific, Singapore 1985).
- [2] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on quantum mechanics* (Belfer graduate School, Yeshiba University Press, New York, 1964).
- [3] I. A. Batalin and E. S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. **B 180** (1986) 157; Nucl. Phys. **B 279** (1987) 514; I. A. Batalin and I. V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 6** (1991) 3255.
- [4] R. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. **D 48** (1993) R5467.
- [5] W. T. Kim and Y.-J. Park, Phys. Lett. **B 336** (1994) 376.
- [6] W. T. Kim and M. S. Yoon, hep-th/9808076.
- [7] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Rev. **D 28** (1983) 2567; Erratum: *ibid.* **D 30** (1984) 508; Nucl. Phys. **B 234** (1984) 106; J. Math. Phys. **26** (1985) 172.
- [8] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of gauge systems* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992).
- [9] D. Birmingham, M. Rakowski, and G. Thompson, Nucl. Phys. **B 329** (1990) 83.
- [10] L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. M. F. Labastida, and A. V. Ramallo, Nucl. Phys. **B 334** (1990) 103.